

A suggestion for the second edition of Mr. Blochmann's Āin.—By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE (Communicated by the PHILOLOGICAL SECRETARY).

[Read, March 1895.]

Having had occasion to distinguish amongst the various *Mīraks* of Akbar's time, I have, in Mr. Blochmann's index, come across *emendanda* under the head *Mīrak*, which moreover, for clearness' sake, render some slight modifications in the text desirable. Mr. Beveridge has been so kind, by reference to the Persian, as to verify the doubts which I had gathered from the translations.

Amongst the seven entries of *Mīrak* in the index, I find that three seem to refer to the same man. One *Mīrak* is omitted and him too, I identify with the thrice-entered *amīr*.

The three first named are :—

1. *Mīrak Khān Arghūn*, 475 ¹ (No. 208).
2. *Mīrak Khān*, 439.
3. *Mīrak Khān Bahādur*, 532.

The omission is :—

4. *Mīrak Khān Jinkjank* (?) 531.

The first and third of these are separately entered by a mere slip, for they refer, respectively, to the biographical notice of *Mīrak Arghūn* and to his name in the combined *Ṭabaqāt* and *Āin* lists of the *amīrs*.

It is equally clear that the second and fourth names denote one individual. Turning to page 439, we find Mr. Blochmann warning us against confounding *Rawazī Khān*, *Mīrzā Mīrak* “with *Mīrak Khān* or with *Mīrak Bahādur* (208).” He writes as follows :—(*Mīrak Khān*) “an old grandee who died in 975.” (*Ṭabaqāt*.) ²

The words quoted are used in the original (Lakhnau edition, 385) about *Mīrak Khān Jinkjank* (*Kinhak* or *Kinjak*). So far as we have been able to trace, this is the only mention of *Jinkjank* or its approximate readings. Apparently then, Mr. Blochmann's *Mīrak Khān* (p. 439) is

¹ All references are to Mr. Blochmann's *Āin*, unless otherwise assigned.

² The word “*Ṭabaqāt*” is quoted by me from Blochmann.

the *Jinkjank* of Nizām's list (No. 99). All that is needed to make this clear in the text is to give the full name Mīrak Khān Jinkjank (?) as found at the place from which the quotation ("an old grandee, etc.") is taken.

The next point to which attention is to be given is the identification of *Jinkjank* with *Arghūn*.

We know that the former died in 975 H., the year of Citōr. We know that the latter was killed in 975 H., in an explosion before Citōr (Mr. Blochmann's *Āīn*, 532, n. 2). This fact is recorded of No. 208 both in the *Ṭabaqāt* and by Abū-l-faḍl. It would be a curious coincidence for two *amīrs* named Mīrak to die in the same year, but this might be so. It is, however, improbable that one of these, being, as Nizāmu-d-dīn says, "an old grandee" should not be mentioned in the detailed stories of any of the contemporary writers, beyond the bare record of his death in the *Ṭabaqāt*. This is the more improbable that he was a man of position sufficient to bring him into Nizām's list. Of Mīrak Arghūn some facts as to service are set down in the biographical notice and he is named honourably amongst the grandees told off to Māl-wā in the sixth year.¹

Now there is no mention of "*Jinkjank*" in the *Āīn* list (531, No. 99), and curiously enough, the Lakhnau *Ṭabaqāt* does not give Mr. Blochmann's No. 115, Mīrak Khān Bahādur."² Perhaps some one having access to other editions of the *Ṭabaqāt* would be so kind as to look up this point and thus add to, or detract from the probability of the identification which now seems reasonable, *i.e.*, that of *Jinkjank* with *Arghūn*. It would also be useful and perhaps decisive if some understanding could be arrived at as to the word *Jinkjank* to which Mr. Blochmann appends a question mark and which the Lakhnau edition gives as *Kinhak* or *Kinjak*.³

Even with the knowledge available now, the identification appears reasonable. A double entry is not unknown elsewhere in Nizām's list;—Mr. Blochmann points out that of Mu. Qāsim Khān.

Pending possible correction on the points, (1) the omission of

¹ The record of Arghūn's death has not yet found its legitimate place in his biography but awaits, in a note, the second edition.

² Similarly "No. 116, Shāh Mu. Qalātī" is not in the Lakhnau *Ṭabaqāt*. The omission of a man so distinguished as Qalātī, points to a printing error, especially as he is not to be found in duplicate in Nizām's list.

³ Since writing these notes, I have learned from Mr. Beveridge that the British Museum MS., No. 29, 209, Vol. II, p. 52, b. gives the word which in other MS. or published editions has been read as *Jinkjank*, *Kinhak*, or *Kinjak* quite clearly as *Jujak* میرک خان ججک (Mīrak Khān Jujak).

No. 115 in the Lakhnau *Ṭabaqāt*, and (2) the meaning of *Jinkjank*, I venture to suggest that the index may, under the head *Mīrak*, read in a second edition of Mr. Blochmann's *Āin*, as follows:—

1. Mīrak Khān Bahādur Arghūn (*Jinkjank* ?) 429, 439, 475 (No. 208), 531, 532.

N. B.—The references to pages 429 and 531 are omitted in the existing index.

2. Mīrak Jalair, 521.

3. Mīrak Khwājah, 525.

4. Mīrak Khwājah, Chengiz Khān, 442.

5. Mīrak Mīrzā, Rawazī Khān, 438 (No. 141).

If it is justifiable to identify *Jinkjank* with *Arghūn* a slight change will follow in the text, where at page 439 and in line 15, “*or with*” should read “*that is.*” The insertion of *Arghūn* after the name *Mīrak* on pages 429, 439, 531 and 532 would be useful to readers.